

the Elevator

Boy Looked on

With Cheerful

Indifference.

promiscuous kissing was a rather pleasant

After her shocking experience she took

a little lunch in the dining room, communi-

cated by telephone with her busband and

in his company made further efforts to in-

duce the hotel to find her tormentors.

feature of life.

one who assaulted her was short and thick

set and wore a check suit. The other was

taller and wore a blue suit. She expresses

her conviction that they were wealthy men

about town, loungers of convivial tastes

Mrs. Gifford explained that she put her

wrongs in the hands of a Brooklyn lawyer

and habitues of the hotel.

Copyright, 1918, by the Star Company. Great Britain Rights Reserved.

wonman, did not notice any such behavior

"Even if the facts were as alleged by

as she mentions, and I think she could

Mrs. Gifford, we are advised that she could

not make us responsible for them. There

are certain laws and rules requiring a hotel

hardly have helped noticing it.

decorum. Obviously a hotel cannot be held responsible for every sudden and unexpected act of disorder committed by any person within its walls. Such a law would make hotel keeping an impossibility.

to maintain order and

"We should not permit a prolonged kissing frolic, but if a man of respectable appearance suddenly went crasy and kissed the first unknown woman within reach she could hardly blame us.

"It is absurd to say that a woman could complain about annoyance, and not receive prompt attention here. We are anxious our own interests to stop any indecorous behavior at the first

house detectives ready to spring to the assistance of any person in distress. It is their first duty to be on hand when needed

Mrs. Gifford's suit for damages was set down for hearing before Judge Lehmann in the New York Supreme Court. Harford Marshall, a prominent lawyer, appeared for Mrs. Gifford. John McKim Minton, formerly Assistant District Attorney, represented the hotel. The defendant's lawyer asked the Judge to dismiss the complaint on the ground that it did not show a proper cause of action.

Even if the original complaint does not stand, it is stated that there are several ways of changing it and bringing the case to trial.

We may, therefore, hear the whole subject of a botel's responsibility for the moral conduct of its guests explained and illustrated in a highly instructive manner.